DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 192 PS 010 097

TITLE A Study of the Needs for Child Care.
SPONS AGENCY Alaska State Dept. of Community and Regional Affairs, Juneau.
PUB DATE Oct 77
NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Care; *Community Size; *Community Surveys; Day Care Services; *Demography; Educational Background; Employment Patterns; Family Characteristics; Family Income; *Needs Assessment; Parent Attitudes; Rural Urban Differences; State Aid
IDENTIFIERS *Alaska

ABSTRACT

This report presents the findings of an Alaska State Department community survey of child care needs in Alaskan population centers typical of 4 kinds of communities found in Alaska (urban area, moderate-size town, small town and native regional center). The purpose of the study was to provide reliable data for statewide planning. Professional interviewers collected data on such variables as family size, age of children, educational levels, family income, employment, availability and convenience of child care and within-family child care. Researchers also investigated eligibility for child care services, willingness to pay for services, and attitudes toward state support of child care services and state licensing of child care personnel. Survey data are presented in 23 tables. Included is a summary of the data in the form of a data narrative combining survey questions with total sample percentages for each response and a summary report of methodological procedures. Findings indicate that eligibility for child care services is high but that knowledge of state funding resources is low among the sample population. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED160192

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PS

A Study of the Needs for Child Care

Rowan Group Report
for the
State of Alaska
Department of Community and Regional Affairs
Division of Community and Rural Development
Child Assistance Programs

October 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. Harvey Pitts
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

PS010097

Introduction

This is a report on 520 personal interviews conducted in Anchorage, Ketchikan, Wasilla and Kotzebue under a location-sample design, and providing reliable data for the purposes of government planning.

The study was about child care services and the data brings forth observations about each of the typical communities chosen for the survey, as well as information of statewide implication. The communities for the study were selected by the Department, while all other aspects of this study were under our control. An abstract and a detailed explanation of the methodology is included with this report, along with a Data-Narrative and a series of tables relating the important findings in a usable context. Other parts of the report, (e.g., the computer printout, statistical analysis, etc.) are delivered under separate cover.

We extend our gratitude to the people at the Division of Community and Rural Development, the Department of Community and Regional Affairs, who assisted us with the questionnaire and worked with us throughout the study period, to insure a quality product and a meaningful planning tool. With this letter, we now transmit the findings of the study to the Department.

Michael Rowan

President
ROWAN GROUP
525 W 3rd Av
Anchorage, Alaska

October,1977

Introduction to the findings:

The following pages describe the essential findings of the study. References are made to analytic tables drawn from the data-processing computer printout shown as "(Table 6)," for example. Other references are made to gross percentages overall, which can be found in the Data-Narrative section of this report, under the question number so cited"(DN-Q10)," for example.

All tables and data so presented can be traced to the computer printout, or a factoring of same.

THE FINDINGS

The communities studied vary slightly in terms of family size, although the Alaskan family appears to bear a close resemblance in size to the American average. Ketchikan families are slightly larger than families found in the other communities studied, but not markedly so(Table 1).

Likewise, children under 18, 11, and 6, taken as three groups, are distributed rather evenly in the families studied, with Ketchikan families having a greater quantity than the other communities (Table 2), consistent with the earlier finding.

The data indicates the distribution of children in the three groups, or sets, in Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6. The variations by community are significant, again, only in pointing out the Ketchikan difference. The reasons behind the difference in family size and number of children in the communities was not explored by the study.

Educational levels of the respondents (spokes-persons for families) also vary by community. As might be expected, the urban communities have the largest share of upper-level educated individuals. In Kotzebue, where most of the community (and most of the respondents) is Alaska Native, one-third have completed only some high school(Table 23). There, 11% of the respondents completed college compared to 20% in Anchorage, 18% in Ketchikan, and 15% in Wasilla.

There are also significant differences in family income by community. Anchorage has the highest percentage of upper-income families (31% reporting annual family income of $27,000 or more), and Kotzebue has the largest share of lower-income families (25% reporting annual family income of $6,000 or less). This is detailed in Table 21.

Anchorage is alone among the communities with a majority of families reporting annual family income above $20,000. Wasilla, Ketchikan and Kotzebue follow in average family income, with 69% of Kotzebue families reporting annual family income below $20,000. (Table 22).

Employment is distributed rather evenly throughout the communities, but unemployment is not(Table 18). High unemployment is found in Wasilla (26%); no causes for this are apparent from other data gathered in the study -- perhaps it's seasonal, or relates to changes in the local economy. Anchorage reports 19.5% unemployment, and Alaska State employment statistics for the municipality have reflected this phenomenon since the termination of pipeline activity. Ketchikan is a community with 32% of the respondents reporting that they are housepersons, compared to 17% or less for the other three communities; this, in combination with earlier data on family size and the distribution of children by community, suggests that Ketchikan fits the model of a traditional American community more than the other communities. Full or part-time employment of both parents in an Alaska household is a common phenomenon.

Full or part time employment of both parents in the typical Alaskan family creates a situation where neither parent is available at home during the day to take care of children(Table 19). Almost all families with neither parent at home to care for children have both parents employed full or part-time. This is true in each community in which the situation is found(Table 20).

Parents are not available for child day-care in 34% of the cases in Kotzebue, 26% of the cases in Ketchikan, 17% of the cases in Wasilla and Anchorage(Table 15).

A plurality of families with children under 18 at home report that day-care, pre-school and child care centers are conveniently available, with the exception of Wasilla, where 14% of the families report child care services conveniently available, and 17% do not. We have no data on why this variation exists in Wasilla. (Table 16).

From 10% to 18% of the families in the four communities report utilizing some child care service within the previous year. Utilization is highest in Kotzebue (18%), and between 10%/12% in the other three communities(Table 17). Families with children under 18 and reporting convenient availability of child care services make up a larger percentage for each community. Lack of use of some of the services is caused by some of the families not meeting criteria for some of the service programs, as indicated below.

Most child care services are delivered to Alaskan families meeting three basic criteria, which are:

a. The presence of children under 10 in the home.

b. Both parents working or in training or school, and thus unavailable for day-care.

c. Annual family income falls under $20,000.

Based upon these criteria, factor analysis shows that 20% of the families in Kotzebue are eligible for services, 13% of the families in Ketchikan, 9% in Wasilla, and 6% in Anchorage. (Because of non-disclosure of family income in some cases, the figure could be slightly greater in both Anchorage and Ketchi-can). The factor which makes a significant portion of families with children under 10 and with no daytime parent at home ineligible for state assistance, is income. Family income is highest in Anchorage, where eligibility is lowest.

The study also found that families are willing to pay for child care services a rate averaging between $8 and $11 a day(DN-Q10). There is widespread agreement with the policy of the state paying a portion of day care services for families, based upon their ability to pay, if it allows the parents to work or to go to school as a result(DN-Q11). However, 31% of all re-spondents knew that the state had such a policy, while 23% did not think so, and 46% professed not to know(DN-Q12).

There is majority agreement in all communities that the state should give more support to the provision of child care services, (DN-Q13), and most of the 10% re-questing less support are in an age bracket where children are not present in the home.

Likewise, a majority exists in each community (giving no effect to the "no opinion") to leave children in licensed child-care hands; overall, 56% say so, with 36% saying it makes no difference to them if the babysitter is licensed or not(DN-Q14). Those choosing licensed babysitters feel

that licensed child-care personnel are more responsible, qualified, trained, supervised, or inspected. (DN-Q15).

Only 7% of the respondents overall had heard of the availability of a child-care revolving fund to provide facilities for child care in Alaska(DN-Q17), which is similar to the earlier finding of ignorance about other state-provided child care services and criteria.

+++

Table 1

Distribution of the Four Sample Populations by Size of Household of Residence, in Whole Numbers and as a Percentage of their respective Community's Total Sample Population.

Number Of Persons	Anchorage Sample=795		Ketchikan Sample=366		Wasilla Sample=235		Kotzebue Sample=210	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
One	56	7.0%	16	4.4%	13	5.5%	19	9.0%
Two	148	18.6%	32	8.7%	30	12.8%	26	12.4%
Three	147	18.5%	54	14.8%	36	15.3%	60	28.6%
Four	196	24.6%	64	17.5%	52	22.1%	40	19.0%
Five	160	20.1%	100	27.3%	60	25.5%	35	16.7%
Six	66	8.3%	54	14.8%	36	15.3%	6	2.9%
Seven	14	1.8%	21	5.7%	--	--	7	3.3%
Eight	8	1.0%	16	4.4%	8	3.4%	8	3.8%
Nine	--	--	9	2.5%	--	--	9	4.3%
	795		366		235		210	

Table 2

Distribution of Children by Age and Community of Residence, in Whole Numbers and as Percentages of their Respective Total Sample Populations.

	0 - 5		6 - 10		11 - 17		18 - 20		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	% of S
Anchorage	103	12.9%	78	9.8%	114	14.3%	27	3.5%	322	40.5%
Ketchikan	54	14.8%	53	14.4%	74	20.2%	10	2.8%	191	52.2%
Wasilla	29	12.3%	27	11.5%	46	19.6%	8	3.4%	110	46.8%
Kotzebue	42	20.0%	26	12.4%	20	9.6%	8	3.9%	96	45.7%

ROBISON GROUP INC.

Table 3

ANCHORAGE

Distribution of Children in Anchorage sample Population by Age Intervals Shown, in Whole Numbers, as a Percentage of the Total Sample Population (n=795) and With Estimates of the Community Population Distribution Given a Total Population of 175,603 Residents.

# per household in interval	0 - 5			6 - 10			11 - 17			18 - 20		
	#	%	Est.*	#	%	Est.*	#	%	Est.*	#	%	Est.*
One	52	6.5%	11.41	44	5.5%	9.66	29	3.6%	6.32	18	2.3%	4.04
Two	42	5.3%	9.31	34	4.3%	7.55	46	5.8%	10.18	6	.8%	1.40
Three	9	1.1%	1.93	--	--	--	27	3.4%	5.97	3	.4%	.70
Four	--	--	--	--	--	--	12	1.5%	2.63	--	--	--
Total:	103	12.9%	22.65	78	9.8%	17.21	114	14.3%	25.1	27	3.5%	6.14

In thousands

ROWAN GROUP INC.

Table 4

KETCHIKAN

Distribution of Children in Ketchikan Sample Population by Age Intervals Shown, in Whole Numbers, as a Percentage of the Total Sample Population (n=366) and With Estimates of the Community Population Distribution Given a Total Population of 7,770 Residents.

# per Household in interval	0 - 5			6 - 10			11 - 17			18 - 20		
	#	%	Est.	#	%	Est.	#	%	Est.	#	%	Est.
One	26	7.1%	552	18	4.9%	382	12	3.3%	255	8	2.2%	171
Two	12	3.3%	255	32	8.7%	679	22	6.0%	466	2	0.6%	47
Three	12	3.3%	255	3	0.8%	64	18	4.9%	382	--	--	--
Four	4	1.1%	85	--	--	--	12	3.3%	255	--	--	--
Five	--	--	--	--	--	--	10	2.7%	212	--	--	--
Total:	54	14.8%	1147	53	14.4%	1125	74	20.2%	1570	10	2.8%	218

ROWAN GROUP INC.

Table 5

WASILLA

Distribution of Children in Wasilla Sample Population by Age intervals Shown, in Whole Numbers, as a Percentage of the Total Sample Population (n=235) and With Estimates of the Community Population Distribution Given a Total Population of 1,566 Residents.

# per Household In Interval	0 - 5			6 - 10			11 - 17			18 - 20		
	#	%	Est.	#	%	Est.	#	%	Est.	#	%	Est.
One	13	5.5%	86	12	5.1%	80	8	3.4%	53	6	2.6%	41
Two	16	6.8%	106	12	5.1%	80	20	8.5%	133	2	.8%	12
Three	--	--	--	3	1.3%	20	18	7.7%	120	--	--	--
Four	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total:	29	12.3%	192	27	11.5%	180	46	19.6%	306	8	3.4%	53

ROWAN GROUP INC.

Table 6

KOTZEBUE

Distribution of Children in Kotzebue Sample Population by Age Intervals Shown, in Whole Numbers, as a Percentage of the Total Sample Population (n=210) and With Estimates of the Community Population Distribution Given a Total Population of 2,431 Residents.

# per Household in Interval	0 - 5			6 - 10			11 - 17			18 - 20		
	#	%	Est.	#	%	Est.	#	%	Est.	#	%	Est.
One	25	11.9%	289	12	5.7%	139	10	4.8%	116	6	2.9%	69
Two	8	3.8%	93	8	3.8%	93	4	1.9%	46	2	1.0%	23
Three	9	4.3%	104	6	2.9%	69	6	2.9%	69	--	--	--
Total:	42	20.0%	486	26	12.4%	301	20	9.6%	231	8	3.9%	92

ROWAN GROUP INC.

Table 7

ANCHORAGE

Distribution of Total Sample Population of Anchorage by Marital/Family Status of Household of Residence, and Community Estimates of Same with Given Population Figure of 175,603 Residents.

	Samp. H/H	Samp. Pop.	Sample %	Commun. Pop.*	Mean Size	Est. # of Families*
Two-Parent Families	132	543	68.3%	119.94	4.11	29.18
Single-Parent Families	20	64	8.1%	14.14	3.2	4.42
Couples - No Children	66	132	16.6%	29.15	2	14.58
Single/Divorced/ Widowed	56	56	7.0%	12.36	1	12.36
Total:	274	795		175.59		60.54

* In Thousands

Table 8

KETCHIKAN

Distribution of Total Sample Population of Ketchikan by Marital/Family Status of Household of Residence, and Community Estimates of Same with Given Population Figure of 7,770 Residents.

	Samp. H/H	Samp. Pop.	Sample %	Commun. Pop.	Mean Size	Est. # of families
Two-Parent Families	62	286	78.1%	6,071	4.4	1,377
Single-Parent Families	11	40	10.9%	849	3.6	233
Couples-No Children	12	24	6.6%	510	2	255
Single/Divorced Widowed	16	16	4.4%	340	1	340
Total:	101	366		7,770		2,205

Table 9

WASILLA

Distribution of Total Sample Population of Wasilla by Marital/Family Status of Household of Residence, and Community Estimates of Same with Given Population Figure of 1,566 Residents.

	Samp. H/H	Samp. Pop.	Sample %	Commun. Pop.	Mean Size	Est. # of Families
Two-Parent Families	39	173	73.6%	1,152	4.4	260
Single-Parent Families	6	21	8.9%	139	3.5	40
Couples-No Children	14	28	11.9%	186	2	93
Single/Divorced/Widowed	13	13	5.5%	86	1	86
Total:	72	235		1,566		479

Table 10

KOTZEBUE

Distribution of Total Sample Population of Kotzebue by Marital/Family Status of Household of Residence, and Community Estimate of Same with Given Population Figure of 2,431 Residents.

	Samp. H/H	Samp. Pop.	Sample %	Commun. Pop.	Mean Size	Est. # of Families
Two-Parent Families	38	149	71.0%	1,726	4.6	379
Single-Parent Families	11	32	15.2%	370	2.9	127
Couples-No Children	5	10	4.8%	116	2	57
Single/Divorced/Widowed	19	19	9.0%	220	1	220
Total:	73	210		2,432		783

Table 11

Distribution of Children by the Total Number of Children in Household of Residence and as a Percentage of the Sample Population of Their Respective Communities

	Anchorage (Samp pop.= 795)		Ketchikan (Samp. pop.= 366)		Wasilla (Samp. Pop = 235)		Kotzebue (Samp. Pop = 210)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
One	51	6.4%	20	5.4%	10	4.2%	28	13.3%
Two	106	13.3%	32	8.7%	32	13.6%	18	8.6%
Three	96	12.1%	63	17.2%	30	12.8%	21	10.0%
Four	44	5.5%	36	9.8%	32	13.6%	8	3.8%
Five	20	2.5%	15	4.1%	--	--	--	--
Six	6	.8%	18	4.9%	6	2.6%	12	5.7%
Seven	--	--	7	1.9%	--	--	7	3.3%
Total:	323	40.6%	191	52.0%	110	46.8%	94	44.7%

Table 12

Distribution of Children in Two-Parent Families by the Total Number of Children in Household of Residence and as a Percentage of the Total Sample Population of Their Respective Communities.

	Anchorage (Samp. Pop = 795)		Ketchikan (Samp. Pop = 366)		Wasilla (Samp. Pop = 235)		Kotzebue (Samp. Pop = 210)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
One	43	5.4%	16	4.3%	9	3.8%	20	9.5%
Two	94	11.8%	28	7.6%	26	11.0%	18	8.6%
Three	90	11.3%	57	15.5%	30	12.8%	18	8.6%
Four	36	4.5%	32	8.7	24	10.2%	4	1.9%
Five	10	1.3%	10	2.7%	--	--	--	--
Six	6	.8%	12	3.3%	6	2.6%	6	2.9%
Seven	--	--	7	1.9%	--	--	7	3.3%
Total:	279	35.1%	162	44.0%	95	40.4%	73	34.8%

Table 13

Distribution of Children in Single-Parent Families by the Total Number of Children in Household of Residence and as a Percentage of the Total Sample Population of Their Respective Communities

	Anchorage (Samp. Pop = 795)		Ketchikan (Samp. Pop = 366)		Wasilla (Samp. Pop = 235)		Kotzebue (Samp pop = 210)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
One	8	1.0%	4	1.1%	1	.4%	8	3.8%
Two	12	1.5%	4	1.1%	6	2.6%	--	--
Three	6	.8%	6	1.6%	--	--	3	1.4%
Four	8	1.0%	4	1.1%	8	3.4%	4	1.9%
Five	10	1.3%	5	1.4%	--	--	--	--
Six	--	--	6	1.6%	--	--	6	2.9%
Total:	44	5.6%	29	7.9%	15	6.4%	21	10.0%

Table 14

Distribution of eligible families according to child care program criteria*, by community.

	Eligible	Ineligible	Other**
Anchorage	6%	93%	1%
Ketchikan	13%	83%	4%
Wasilla	9%	91%	--
Kotzebue	20%	80%	--

* The eligibility criteria being threefold: (1) the family includes at least one child under 10; (2) no parent is available at home for day care because of employment, training or school; and (3) the annual family income falls below $20,000.

** Eligible otherwise, but refused to provide income information.

Table 15

Availability of parents-at-home
for child day-care, by community.

	Anchorage	Ketchikan	Wasilla	Kotzebue
Parent at home	22.9%	34.3%	27.8%	22.5%
Parent not home	17.0%	25.7%	16.7%	33.8%
Not a Parent*	60.1%	40.0%	55.6%	43.7%

*Note: These percentages refer to families in which children under 18 are not present.

Table 16

Convenient availability of Day care, pre-school, and child care centers as reported by family spokesperson in the four communities.

	Conveniently available	Available but not convenient	Don't know
Anchorage	20%	9%	12%
Ketchikan	29%	12%	19%
Wasilla	14%	17%	14%
Kotzebue	38%	10%	8%

Note: Percentages do not add to 100% since none of those with no children under 18 responded to the question.

Table 17

Comparison of % of applicable* families reporting all child services are conveniently available and % of families actually using the services within the last year.

	Families reporting convenient availability	Families actually using the services
Anchorage	20%	11%
Ketchikan	29%	12%
Wasilla	14%	10%
Kotzebue	38%	18%

*Note: "Applicable" in this table refers to a family which has at least one child under 18.

Table 18

Distribution of employment of respondents by community in which they live.

	Anchorage	Ketchikan	Wasilla	Kotzebue
Employed full time	49.3%	44.8%	37.5%	52.1%
Employed part time	11.4%	13.3%	11.1%	12.7%
Unemployed	19.5%	6.7%	26.4%	8.5%
Taking training or in school	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%
Houseperson	14.0%	32.4%	12.5%	16.9%
Retired	3.3%	2.9%	12.5%	7.0%

Table 19

Employment and its relationship to the availability or non-availability of a parent at home to care for children.

	Parent at Home		
	Yes	No	Not applicable
Employed full time	20.1%	68.8%	51.8%
Employed part time	0.7%	27.5%	10.9%
Unemployed	34.3%	0.0%	14.1%
In training or education	0.0%	3.7%	1.8%
Houseperson	43.3%	0.0%	12.7%
Retired	1.5%	0.0%	8.7%

Note: Percents refer to respondents speaking for self in terms of employment and both parents in terms of availability.

Table 20

Employment and its relationship to the non-availability of a parent at home to care for children, for all applicable families, by location.

	Anchorage	Ketchikan	Wasilla	Kotzebue
Full time	10.9%	17.0%	10.6%	28.6%
Part time	4.7%	10.0%	5.3%	4.3%
In training or school	1.4%	--	--	1.4%

Note: Percents refer to respondents speaking for self in terms of employment and both parents in terms of availability.

Table 21

Distribution of family income
by community of family residence.

	Anchorage	Ketchikan	Wasilla	Kotzebue
under $6000	9.9%	13.3%	11.1%	25.4%
$6000-13,999	16.2%	9.5%	22.2%	22.5%
$14,000-19,999	15.4%	25.7%	18.1%	21.1%
$20,000-26,999	20.6%	21.0%	22.2%	11.3%
$27,000 or more	31.3%	16.2%	20.8%	19.7%
refused	6.6%	14.3%	5.6%	0.0%

Table 22

Distribution of families with incomes above and below $20,000 per annum by community.

	Anchorage	Ketchikan	Wasilla	Kotzebue
above $20,000	51.7%	39.0%	41.7%	31.0%
below $20,000	41.3%	44.8%	52.8%	69.0%
refused	7.0%	16.2%	5.6%	0.0%

Table 23

Education by location

	Anchorage	Ketchikan	Wasilla	Kotzebue
Some high school	15.1%	6.7%	18.1%	33.8%
High school graduate	32.4%	40.0%	43.1%	25.4%
Some college	30.9%	33.3%	32.6%	28.2%
College graduate or beyond	20.2%	18.1%	15.3%	11.3%
Refused	1.5%	1.9%	--	1.4%

DATA NARRATIVE

01. Age of respondent

24.7%	18-25
42.7	26-39
26.3	40-59
6.4	60 or older

02. Sex of respondent

34.0%	Male
66.0	Female

03. Are day care homes, pre-school, and child care centers conveniently available in this community?

23.3%	Yes
10.8	No
13.1	Don't know
52.9	Not applicable

(IF YES) How many children in this household have used within the last year:

04. Day Care Home services

76.9%	Not applicable
18.7	Zero-none
2.9	One
1.2	Two
0.4	Three or more

05. Pre-school services

76.9%	Not applicable
20.4	Zero-none
1.9	One
0.8	Two
0.0	Three or more

06. Child Care Center services

76.9%	Not applicable
18.5	Zero-none
3.1	One
1.5	Two
0.0	Three or more

(IF "NO" OR "DON'T KNOW") If it were conveniently available how many children in this household would use:

07. Day Care Home services

76.3%	Not applicable
15.8	Zero-none
5.4	One
1.5	Two
1.0	Three or more

08. Pre-school services

76.3%	Not applicable
17.3	Zero-none
5.2	One
1.2	Two
0.0	Three or more

09. Child Care Center services

76.3%	Not applicable
18.3	Zero-none
3.5	One
1.3	Two
0.6	Three or more

10. If you were to leave a child in a licensed day care home or center, how much would you be willing to pay per day?

53.2%	Not applicable
13.9	Don't Know
5.0	$4-$5
3.5	$6-$7
13.7	$8-$9
7.9	$10-$11
1.3	$12-$13
1.0	$14-$15
0.6	$16 or more

11. Do you favor or oppose the state paying a portion of day care services for families, based upon their ability to pay, if it allows the parents to work or to go to school as a result?

75.4%	Favor
16.0	Oppose
8.7	No opinion

12. Does the state, in fact, have such a program, to you knowledge?

31.3%	Yes
22.7	No
46.0	Don't know

13. Should the state give more or less support to the provision of child care services in Alaska, as you see it?

53.3%	More
10.2	Less
10.8	Same
25.8	Don't know

14. Any person babysitting or caring for five or more children must be licensed by the government. Tell me this: would you rather a child be left with a licensed or an unlicensed babysitter, or would it make no difference to you?

56.3%	Licensed
3.3	Unlicensed
35.6	Makes no difference
4.8	No opinion

15. (IF "LICENSED") Why?

44.8%	Not applicable
15.4	Trained/more qualified (knowledgable, more experienced, better prepared, knows what they're doing)
10.0	More responsible/secure (reliable, safer)
6.9	Better care/supervision (unlicensed not trustworthy)
7.1	Are inspected/checked (screened)
9.2	Have met standards/requirments (follow guidelines)
3.5	Better/safer facilities
2.7	Other
0.4	No opinion

Other comments: They are bonded and insured; can do it with justification; number of children involved (3); taxes revolving; depends on the parents need; we license cars, why not baby-sitters?; would prefer someone that is known; the person with a license would be more eligible for the services the state has to offer; more protected legally; to know more about them; should be an older person.

16. (IF "UNLICENSED") Why?

96.3%	Not applicable
1.2	Would know personally
0.6	Give better/individual care
1.0	Not a government issue (private decision between two parties)
1.0	Other
0.0	No opinion

Other comments: Because it is hard for everyone to get a license, gives teenagers a chance to work; just as many qualified that are not licensed; inconvenient to get license; up here, need no license.

17. Have you heard of the availability of a child care revolving fund to provide facilities for child care in Alaska?

6.9%	Yes
87.1	No
6.0	Don't know

18. Are you employed?

47.1%	Full time
11.9	Part time
16.3	Unemployed
1.7	Taking training/schooling
17.9	Houseperson
5.0	Retired

19. Is the other parent (or spouse, if childless) employed?

53.1%	Full time
4.2	Part time
4.4	Unemployed
0.8	Taking training/schooling
4.6	Houseperson
4.2	Retired
28.7	No spouse

20. Into which of the following catagories does your annual income fall?

12.9%	Under $6000
16.5	$6000 - $13,999
18.7	$14,000 - $19,999
19.6	$20,000 - $26,999
25.2	$27,000 or more
7.1	Refused

21. What is the last level of education you completed?

16.3%	Some high school
34.4	High school graduate
30.0	Some college
17.9	College graduate or beyond
1.3	Refused

22. Location

52.3%	Anchorage
20.2	Ketchikan
13.8	Wasilla
13.7	Kotzebue

23. Income

44.9%	Above $20,000
47.4	Below $20,000
7.7	Refused

24. Number of people in household

41.4%	One, two
36.4	Three, four
19.5	Five, six
2.7	Seven or more

25. Number of children 17 years old or younger.

21.2%	One
17.3	Two
12.9	Three
8.1	Four or more
32.8	No children
7.7	Zero (no children that age group)

26. Number of children 10 years old or younger.

22.7%	One
15.0	Two
8.1	Three
1.3	Four or more
32.9	No children
19.8	Zero (no children that age group

27. Number of children 5 years old or younger.

22.5%	One
7.7	Two
2.1	Three
0.4	Four or more
32.9	No children
34.3	Zero (no children that age group)

28. Is a parent available for children's day care.

25.8%	Parent at home
21.0	Parent not at home
53.2	Not a parent (no child care age children)

METHODOLOGY: Abstract

This study was designed around classic techniques used for accurate, reliable location studies. The communities were selected as typical of four kinds of communities found in Alaska. A significant number of interviews was assigned to each community. Professional interviewers were assigned to conduct the interviews in the households of each community, selected under a random-selection process. All data collected through the interviewing instrument was comparative, and was data-processed. A statistical analysis was performed on the data. Tables were drawn from the computer printout, and assembled for the report. A final report was written.

METHODOLOGY: Detail

(1) Community selection. The Department of Community and Regional Affairs selected Anchorage, Ketchikan, Wasilla and Kotzebue as four various communities typical of others in the state. The demography, culture, and size of each of these communities contributed to their selection. Anchorage was felt to be urban and typical of itself and Fairbanks. Ketchikan was selected as typical of a moderate-size town like Petersburg, Juneau, etc. Wasilla was selected as a smaller-type town, and Kotzebue was selected as a Native regional center, also providing some information as a village.

While selected by the Department, this company agreed with the selections based upon the demographic differences in the communities as they tended to represent or typify Alaska communities in general.

(2) Sample design. This company then assigned a number to each of the four communities, for sample size. This we communicated to the Department in our memorandum of proposal dated June 22, 1977. The logic of each number is based upon the size of the community studied, history of samples by size in each community, and the need for each sample to achieve its own reliability. In other words, we have four samples here, not one.

Since the respondent was to provide information for the household (respondent = household spokesman), the sample number related directly to number of households in each community, known facts. In similar national household studies, it is assumed by Gallup, Harris, Roper, Yankelovich, etc. that .00003 per cent, or three-ten-thousandths of the universe, is an adequate expression for sample size. History has indicated this is correct, since the national polls can be checked against known facts about the American people.

However, there is a bottom-line number under which a sample size loses reliability; this number is fixed by known criteria derived from experience. In the four communities studied, the sample number selected in each case exceeds .00003 per cent by several hundred times. The following table indicates the number of interviews as an expression of the percent of households by each community.

Community Name	# Interviews Assigned (S)	Interviews as % of households
Anchorage	272	.0062
Ketchikan	105	.0437
Wasilla	72	.1107
Kotzebue	71	.1290

While it may seem a great waste to interview respondents in over 10% of the households of the smaller communities, this need was dictated by the principles involved. Thus, while it could be argued that the samples are too large, there is no question about their being too small, and no existing evidence known to us that they are too small.

(3) Sample selection and interviewing. A questionnaire was prepared and approved by the Department. Interviewers trained by our Manual were instructed for the project in each community. A plan was devised which selected households at random, and proportionately distributed throughout the community. Interviewers visited these households and qualified a respondent. Inapplicable respondents or households were replaced in the same manner as the original distribution called for. All respondents are drawn from the communities, therefore, in a proportional means based upon household distribution; and all respondents were asked to report information for the entire household.

(4) Upon completion and collection of all instruments, company staff coded responses and designed a computer program to process the data. This called for crosstabulation of data, yielding a printout. After study, further crosstabulations involving multiples of factors produced new tables going to the direct information needed by the Department. These tables were prepared without elaboration and are delivered in this report.

A Data-Narrative is also included; this is a replay of all questions as-asked, all responses as-given and as-recorded, with gross percentages for all responses and all community respondents lumped together. It is useful for reference, but only the tables are fully applicable to analysis, since the tables break out the communities.

A statistical analysis, the Mann-Whitney U test, has been performed on the data by Dr. Armand Schroeder, who provided the electronic data-processing for this study. This is delivered under separate cover.

(5) All questionnaires, coding sheets, computer printouts and other materials leading to, or used as part of, this report, are hereby given to the Department. A proviso is maintained for all respondents, who were promised confidentiality. The data was not punched, but rather is in magnetic tape at Alaskan Data Systems Inc. (Dr. Schroeder) where, if you have further use for it, it can be found.

Any assistance we can provide in the use or delineation of the data, we hereby offer to the Department, with our hope that it has been a useful study.

Summary

We find that this study followed its design pattern exactly, and was implemented in such a way as to guarantee reliability for each of the communities studied, and according to the variations indicated by Dr. Schroeder's statistical analysis.

This company has designed similar studies for other governments or departments, where the data has been used for budgeting or program purposes. Notable among these are the Office of the Governor, the State Department of Planning, Programming and Development, the State Department of Health and Education, the State Department of Fish and Game, the Municipality of Anchorage, the federal department for Housing and Urban Development, the federal General Services Administration, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In each case, data derived from our studies was applied to programming, planning or budgeting.

Rowan Group has conducted more than twelve thousand interviews in Alaska since 1971, most of these for government. The writer, Michael Rowan, has been admitted as an expert witness before both state and federal courts, relating to survey research design and the analysis of findings.

It is our opinion that the survey studies conducted for the Department of Community and Regional Affairs, and reported on in this document, can be used by the Department with reliability, as noted, and for the purposes of planning and programming.